UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

M/

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/665,442	09/19/2000	Stephen J. Brown	00-0920 / 7553.00055	5890

60683   7590   08/09/2007
HEALTH HERO NETWORK, INC.
2400 GENG ROAD, SUITE 200
PALO ALTO, CA 94303

EXAMINER
KOPPIKAR, VIVEK D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3626	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/09/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/665,442	BROWN, STEPHEN J.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Vivek D. Koppikar	3626	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _22 May 2007_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.　　　2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _47-49, 51-62 and 77-110_ is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _47-49, 51-62 and 77-110_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All　b)☐ Some *　c)☐ None of:

　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06)　　　　　　　Office Action Summary　　　　　　　Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20070724

DETAILED ACTION

Status of the Application

1.   Claims 47-63 and 77-110 have been examined in this application. This communication is

a Final Office Action to the "Amendment" and "Remarks" filed on May 22, 2007.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3.   Claim 47, 55-57, 77, 84, 91, 98, 105 and 107-110 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as

being anticipated by Fujimoto.

(A)   As per claim 47, Fujimoto teaches a system for monitoring a physiological

condition of a individual using a computer network (Fujimoto: Abstract), comprising:

(a) a central processing unit (A) having access to one or more databases and (B) configured to

perform operations according to monitoring application programming, the central processing

unit comprising (i) programming code configured to generate a script program-that collects

measurement data relating to the physiological condition of the individual7 and (ii) further

programming code configured to assiqn the script program to the individual; (Fujimoto: Col. 4,

Ln. 12-68), and

> (ii) further programming code configured to assign the script program to the
>
> individual (Fujimoto: Col. 8, Ln. 8-39);

(b) a remote programming apparatus (i) connectable to a measuring device to receive

measurement data according to a collect command contained in the script program and (ii)

connectable to the central processing unit to transmit the measurement data to the central

processing unit according to a transmit command contained in the script program (Figure 1; Col. 2, Ln. 32-55; Col. 4, Ln. 12-68 and Col. 8, Ln. 8-39)

(c) a workstation connectable to the central processing unit to receive measurement data so that a health care provider may review a report generated based on the measurement data (Fujimoto: Figure 1 and Col. 2, Ln. 32-44).

(B)   As per claim 55, in Fujimoto the script program comprises one ore more queries and one or more response choices for the individual (Fujimoto: Col. 4, Ln. 25-58).

(C)   As per claim 56, in Fujimoto the remote programming comprises a human interface configured to receive one more responses from the individual to the queries to be communicated to the central processing unit. (Fujimoto: Col. 4, Ln. 14-58 and Col. 8, Ln. 13-39)

(D)   As per claim 57, in Fujimoto the remote programming apparatus is sufficiently compact to be hand-held and carried by the individual (Fujimoto: Figure 2 and Col. 2, Ln. 56-68).

(E)   As per claim 77, Fujimoto teaches a method of monitoring a physiological condition of an individual using a computer network the computer network comprising a central processing unit and a remote processing apparatus, the first processing unit having a script program stored therein and the remote apparatus communicating with a measuring device that measures at least one parameter indicative of the physiological condition of the individual (Fujimoto: Abstract and Figures 1 and 2), the method comprising the steps of:

(A)   storing a script assignment that associates the script program with the individual (Fujimoto: Col. 8, Ln. 8-39);

(B)   connecting the first processing unit with the remote processing apparatus (Fujimoto: Col. 2, Ln. 32-55; Col. 3, Ln. 7-29 and Col. 7, Ln. 67-Col. 8, Ln. 8);

(C)   transferring the script program from the central processing unit to the remote processing apparatus;

(D)   executing the script program in the remote processing apparatus to collect measurement data from the measuring device;

(E)   transmitting the measurement data from the remote processing apparatus to the central processing unit upon execution of a transmit command of the script program (Fujimoto: Col. 4, Ln. 14-68 and Col. 8, Ln. 8-39).

(F)   As per claim 84, Fujimoto teaches a method of monitoring a physiological condition of an individual using a computer network the computer network comprising a central processing unit and a remote processing apparatus, the first central unit having a script program stored therein and the remote processing apparatus communicating with a measuring device that measures at least one parameter indicative of the physiological condition of the individual (Fujimoto: Abstract and Figures 1-2) , the method including:

transmitting the script program through a communication link from the central processing unit to the remote programming apparatus (Fujimoto: Col. 8, Ln. 8-39);

disconnecting the communication link after the script program has been transmitted (Fujimoto: Col. 8, Ln. 8-39);

collecting measurement data in the remote processing apparatus as received from the measuring device according to a collect command of the script program (Fujimoto: Col. 4, Ln. 14-68 and Col. 8, Ln. 8-39);

connecting the communication link between remote processing apparatus and the central processing unit after the measurement data has been collected (Fujimoto: Col. 6, Ln. 7-29 and Col. 8, Ln. 8-39); and

transmitting the measurement data from the remote processing apparatus to the central processing unit through the communications link (Fujimoto: Figure 1 and Col. 8, Ln. 8-39).

(G)   As per claims 91 and 98, this claim is substantially similar to Claim 84 and is therefore rejected in the same manner as Claim 84, which is set forth above.

(H)   As per claims 105 and 107-110, these claims are directed towards intermittently

establishing a communication link with the central processing unit and (ii) disconnecting the

communication link after a period of time after each establishment, this feature is taught in

Fujimoto (Col. 8, Ln. 8-39). (Note: Fujimoto discloses sending communications between user

side and the medical institution side (Fujimoto: Col. 8, Ln. 8-13) and it is inherent from this

teaching that the communication occurs intermittently because a telephone normally can only

handle a very limited number of links and if the communication link from the user side to the

medical institution side was not disconnected after some time it would not be possible in the

teachings of Fujimoto to use the telephone for any other purpose then to communicate with a

medical institution and normally a telephone is not used to solely and exclusively communicate

with only one other telephone link).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 48-49 and 51-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

US Patent Number 5,339,821 to Fujimoto as applied to Claim 47 above and in view of US Patent

Number 6,421,633 to Heinonen.

(A)   As per claim 48, Fujimoto does not teach that the physiological condition comprises

diabetes, the measuring device comprises a blood glucose measurement device, and the

measurement data comprises blood glucose data, however these features are well known in the

art as evidenced by Heinonen (Col. 1, Ln. 9-23-Col. 3, Ln. 53-Col. 4, Ln. 34). At the time of the

invention, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have added these aforementioned features from Heinonen to the system of Fujimoto with the motivation of providing a patient with a means of regularly checking their blood glucose level using a self-testing kit, as recited in Heinonen (Col. 1, Ln. 9-11).

(B)   As per claim 49, in the combined system of Fujimoto in view of Heinonen the workstation further comprises script entry programming configured to receive input information from the health care provider and (iii) communicate the information to the central processing unit the central processing unit generates and assigns the script program to the individual (Fujimoto: Col. 8, Ln. 8-21).

(C)   As per claim 51, in the combined system of Fujimoto in view of Heinonen the monitoring application programming is configured to instruct the central processing unit to generate said report based on the collected blood glucose data (Fujimoto: Col. 8, Ln. 35-40).

(E)   As per claim 52, in the combined system of Fujimoto in view of Heinonen the remote processing apparatus further comprises a script interpreter configured to execute the script program (Fujimoto: Col. 8, Ln. 8-39).

(F)   As per claim 53, in the combined system of Fujimoto in view of Heinonen the generating and assigning of the script program comprises appending a unique patient identification code associated with the individual to the script program for the individual (Fujimoto: Col. 8, Ln. 15-21).

(G)   As per claim 54, in the combined system of Fujimoto in view of Heinonen the monitoring application programming is configured to instruct the central processing unit to store the script program in a database, the assignment of the script program including generating a pointer to the script program for the individual and the pointer is stored in a look-up table associated with the database (Fujimoto: Col. 8, Ln. 15-39).

(H)   As per claim 58, the combined method of Fujimoto in view of Heinonen the report comprises a graph illustrating several measurements of the blood glucose data (Fujimoto: Col. 8, Ln. 31-39).

6.   Claims 59-62 and 106 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Number 5,339,821 to Fujimoto in view of US Patent Number 6,421,633 to Heinonen.

(A)   Claim 59 is substantially similar to Claim 47 and is therefore rejected on the same basis as Claim 47, which is set forth above. Claim 59 does include the following feature which is not taught by Fujimoto. Specifically, Fujimoto does not teach that the data relating to the physiological condition of the individual is blood glucose measurement data, however it is well known in the art to measure blood glucose data using a measuring device, as evidenced by Heinonen (Col. 1, Ln. 9-23-Col. 3, Ln. 53-Col. 4, Ln. 34). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have added this aforementioned feature from Heinonen to the system of Fujimoto with the motivation of providing a patient with a means of regularly checking their blood glucose level using a self-testing kit, as recited in Heinonen (Col. 1, Ln. 9-11).

(B)   As per claim 60, in the combined system of Fujimoto in view of Heinonen the physiological condition including diabetes, the measuring device including a blood glucose measurement device(Fujimoto: Col. 2, Ln. 33-40).

(C)   As per claim 61, in the combined system of Fujimoto in view of Heinonen the workstation further comprises script entry programming for configured to enable the health care provider to enter information that is communicated to the central processing unit the central processing unit generates and assigns the script program to the individual (Fujimoto: Col. 8, Ln. 8-21).

(D)   As per claim 62, in the combined system of Fujimoto in view of Heinonen the monitoring application programming is further configured to instruct the central processing unit to generate said report based on the blood glucose data (Fujimoto: Col. 8, Ln. 35-40).

(E)   As per clam 106, this claim is directed towards intermittently establishing a
communication link with the central processing unit and (ii) disconnecting the communication
link after a period of time after each establishment, this feature is taught in Fujimoto (Col. 8, Ln.
8-39). (Note: Fujimoto discloses sending communications between user side and the medical
institution side (Fujimoto: Col. 8, Ln. 8-13) and it is inherent from this teaching that the
communication occurs intermittently because a telephone normally can only handle a very
limited number of links and if the communication link from the user side to the medical
institution side was not disconnected after some time it would not be possible in the teachings of
Fujimoto to use the telephone for any other purpose then to communicate with a medical
institution and normally a telephone is not used to solely and exclusively communicate with only
one other telephone link).

7.   Claims 78-83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent
Number 5,339,821 to Fujimoto as applied to Claim 77 above and in view of US Patent Number
6,421,633 to Heinonen.

(A)   As per claim 78, Fujimoto does not teach that the physiological condition comprises
diabetes, the measuring device comprises a blood glucose measurement device, and the
measurement data comprises blood glucose data, however these features are well known in the
art as evidenced by Heinonen (Col. 1, Ln. 9-23-Col. 3, Ln. 53-Col. 4, Ln. 34). At the time of the
invention, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have added these
aforementioned features from Heinonen to the method of Fujimoto with the motivation of
providing a patient with a means of regularly checking their blood glucose level using a self-
testing kit, as recited in Heinonen (Col. 1, Ln. 9-11).

(B)   As per claim 79, the combined method of Fujimoto in view of Heinonen further
comprising the step of: generating a report in the central processing unit based upon the blood
glucose data (Fujimoto: Col. 2, Ln. 33-40).

(C)   As per claim 80, the combined method of Fujimoto in view of Heinonen further
comprises transmitting the report to a workstation connected with the first processing unit
(Fujimoto: Col. 8, Ln. 8-39).

(D)   As per claim 81, in the combined method of Fujimoto in view of Heinonen the report comprises a graph illustrating several measurements of the blood glucose data (Fujimoto: Col. 8, Ln. 31-39).

(E)   As per claim 82, the combined method of Fujimoto in view of Heinonen further comprises collecting the measurement data by the remote processing apparatus from the measuring device according to a collect command of the script programs received from the central processing unit (Fujimoto: Col. 8, Ln. 8-39).

(F)   As per claim 83, the combined method of Fujimoto in view of Heinonen further comprises generating a message prompting the individual to connect the blood glucose measurement device to the remote processing apparatus; (Fujimoto: Col. 3, Ln. 7-29 and Col. 7, Ln. 67-Col. 8, Ln. 8).

8.   Claims 85-90 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Number 5,339,821 to Fujimoto as applied to Claim 84 above and in view of US Patent Number 6,421,633 to Heinonen.

(A)   As per claim 85, Fujimoto does not teach that the physiological condition comprises diabetes, the measuring device comprises a blood glucose measurement device, and the monitoring device measurement data comprises blood glucose data, however these features are well known in the art as evidenced by Heinonen (Col. 1, Ln. 9-23-Col. 3, Ln. 53-Col. 4, Ln. 34). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have added these aforementioned features from Heinonen to the method of Fujimoto with the motivation of providing a patient with a means of regularly checking their blood glucose level using a self-testing kit, as recited in Heinonen (Col. 1, Ln. 9-11).

(B)   As per claim 86, the combined method of Fujimoto in view of Heinonen further comprises generating a report in the central processing unit based upon the blood glucose data (Fujimoto: Col. 8, Ln. 8-39).

(C)   As per claim 87, the combined method of Fujimoto in view of Heinonen further comprises the step of: transmitting the report to a workstation connected with the central processing unit (Fujimoto: Col. 8, Ln. 7-21).

(D)   As per claim 88, in the combined method of Fujimoto in view of Heinonen the report comprises a graph illustrating several measurements of blood glucose data measurements (Fujimoto, Col. 8, Ln. 31-39).

(E)   As per claim 89, this claim is substantially similar to Claim 83 and is therefore rejected on the same basis as Claim 83, which is set forth above,

(F)   As per claim 90, wherein the transmitting of the blood glucose data from the remote processing apparatus to the central processing unit is according to a transmit command of the script program (Fujimoto: Col. 8, Ln. 31-39).

9.   Claims 92-97 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Number 5,339,821 to Fujimoto as applied to Claim 91 above and in view of US Patent Number 6,421,633 to Heinonen.

(A)   As per claim 92, Fujimoto does not teach that the physiological condition comprises diabetes, the measuring device comprises a blood glucose measurement device, and the monitoring device measurement data comprises blood glucose data, however these features are well known in the art as evidenced by Heinonen (Col. 1, Ln. 9-23-Col. 3, Ln. 53-Col. 4, Ln. 34). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have added these aforementioned features from Heinonen to the storage device of Fujimoto in with the motivation of providing a patient with a means of regularly checking their blood glucose. level using a self-testing kit, as recited in Heinonen (Col. 1, Ln. 9-11).

(B)   As per claim 93, the combined readable storage device of Fujimoto in view of Heinonen comprises generating a report in the central processing unit based upon the collected blood glucose measurement data (Heinonen (Col. 1, Ln. 9-23-Col. 3, Ln. 53-Col. 4, Ln. 34). The

motivation for making this modification to the teachings of Fujimoto is the same as set forth above, in the rejection of Claim 92.

(C)   As per claim 94, the combined readable storage device of Fujimoto in view of Heinonen comprises transmitting the report to a workstation connected with the central processing unit (Fujimoto: Col. 8, Ln. 8-39).

(D)   As per claim 95, the combined readable storage device of Fujimoto in view of Heinonen comprises a graph illustrating several measurements blood glucose data measurements Heinonen (Col. 1, Ln. 9-23-Col. 3, Ln. 53-Col. 4, Ln. 34). The motivation for making this modification to the teachings of Fujimoto is the same as set forth above, in the rejection of Claim 92.

(E)   As per claim 96, the combined readable storage device of Fujimoto in view of Heinonen comprises collecting the blood glucose data by the remote apparatus from the measuring device according to a collect command of one or more script programs received from the central processing unit Heinonen (Col. 1, Ln. 9-23-Col. 3, Ln. 53-Col. 4, Ln. 34). The motivation for making this modification to the teachings of Fujimoto is the same as set forth above, in the rejection of Claim 92.

(F)   As per claim 97, the combined readable storage device of Fujimoto in view of Heinonen comprises prompting for device connection to the remote processing apparatus; and connecting the remote processing apparatus to interface with the blood glucose measurement device Heinonen (Col. 1, Ln. 9-23-Col. 3, Ln. 53-Col. 4, Ln. 34). The motivation for making this modification to the teachings of Fujimoto is the same as set forth above, in the rejection of Claim 92.

10.   Claims 99-104 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Number 5,339,821 to Fujimoto as applied to Claim 91 above and in view of US Patent Number 6,421,633 to Heinonen.

(A)   As per claim 99, Fujimoto does not teach that the physiological condition comprises diabetes, the measuring device comprises a blood glucose measurement device, and the

monitoring device measurement data comprises blood glucose data, however these features are

well known in the art as evidenced by Heinonen (Col. 1, Ln. 9-23-Col. 3, Ln. 53-Col. 4, Ln. 34).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to

have added these aforementioned features from Heinonen to the storage device of Fujimoto in

with the motivation of providing a patient with a means of regularly checking their blood glucose

level using a self-testing kit, as recited in Heinonen (Col. 1, Ln. 9-11).

(B)   As per claim 100, the combined storage device of Fujimoto in view of Heinonen

comprises generating a report in the central processing unit based upon the collected blood

glucose measurement data (Fujimoto: Col. 8, Ln. 35-40).

(C)   As per claim 101, the combined storage device of Fujimoto in view of Heinonen

comprises transmitting the report to a workstation connected with the central processing unit

(Fujimoto: Col. 8, Ln. 8-38).

(D)   As per claim 102, the combined readable storage device of Fujimoto in view of Heinonen

comprises a graph illustrating several measurements blood glucose data (Fujimoto: Col. 8, Ln.

31-39)

(E)   As per claim 103, the combined storage device of Fujimoto in view of Heinonen

comprises a step of generating a message prompting for device connection to the remote

processing apparatus (Fujimoto: Col. 3, Ln. 7-29 and Col. 7, Ln. 63-Col. 8, Ln. 7).

(F)   As per claim 104, the combined storage device of Fujimoto in view of Heinonen

comprises transmitting the measurement data from the remote apparatus to the central processing

unit is according to a transmit command of the one script (Fujimoto: Col. 4, Ln. 14-68 and Col.

8, Ln. 8-38).

Response to Arguments

11.   Applicant's arguments filed on May 22, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

(1)   Applicants argue that Fujimoto appears to be silent regarding the medical terminal

apparatus transmitting measurement data, in the form of a script program, to the host computer

according to a transmit command contained in the script program generated in the host computer.

Applicants also argue that Fujimoto does not teach a collect command. However, the Office

would like to point out that Fujimoto teaches this very feature (Fujimoto: Col. 7, Ln. 25-54 and

Col. 8, Ln. 8-39).

(2)   Applicants argue that Fujimoto does not appear to teach or suggest a step of

disconnecting the communication link after the script program has been transmitted, however, as

set forth above in the rejections of Claims 105-110, Fujimoto does disclose this very feature.

Conclusion

11.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

12.   Any inquire concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vivek Koppikar, whose telephone number is (571) 272-5109. The examiner can normally be reached from Monday to Friday between 8 AM and 4:30 PM.

If any attempt to reach the examiner by telephone is unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas, can be reached at (571) 272-6776. The fax telephone numbers for this group are either (571) 273-8300 or (703) 872-9326 (for official communications including After Final communications labeled "Box AF").

Another resource that is available to applicants is the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR). Information regarding the status of an application can be obtained from the (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAX. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, please feel free to contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sincerely,

Vivek Koppikar

7/25/2007

C. LUKE GILLIGAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600